

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_162145

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No

Accession No.

Author

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

AGGRESSION AND POPULATION

AGGRESSION AND POPULATION

By F. JAMES DAWSON



SALISBURY SQUARE · LONDON

1946

COPYRIGHT 1946

Made and Printed in Great Britain by
WATMOUGHS LIMITED, IDLE, BRADFORD; AND LONDON

Preface

THIS little book has an equally small aim—to restate an old theme and to break a too complete silence by statesmen and publicists to-day on a subject closely concerned with the recent world conflict. It is in no way a thorough, scientific examination of its large theme; such treatments are the concern of other and more competent writers for that purpose, and will be found in various books in several languages.

This writing is addressed to the common man of all lands, for it is his problem and he is the principal actor in the drama. Many of the points and statements in these pages, especially on the economic side, will appear elementary to the experienced student, but they are still too little known and appreciated by the man in the street. For that reason they merit emphasis, and they are intrinsically important to the causes of modern wars.

Another shaping of world peace is in our hands to-day, so the moment is appropriate to direct our minds to a fresh examination of the causal links between so-called aggression and pressure of population. The average citizen in all countries is the source of population; his life and that of his children is the stake at issue. This small volume may encourage him to venture that stake with more appreciation of its implications.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	PAGE 5
1. WHAT IS AGGRESSION ?	9
2. WORLD FACTORS TO-DAY	15
3. SOME NATIONAL FEATURES	25
4. THREE AGGRESSORS	35
5. COLOUR AND WHITE	47
6. SCIENCE TAKES A HAND	54
7. ABJURING AGGRESSION	68
ADDENDUM	74

I

What is Aggression ?

IN the midst of the twentieth century's second world—machine—war, lofty and determined statements issued from politicians and Press on the iniquity of the aggressor nations. "We shall continue this fight until the last vestige of aggression has been crushed from our enemies." "There will be no end to the Pacific conflict until Japanese militarism has been pounded to the dust." "Never again must German or Italian aggression be allowed to disturb the peace of Europe." "This time we must see the problem of Germany through until a complete solution is reached." "The aggressor States must be utterly defeated, and never again allowed the means to threaten world peace." And so on. Such phrases are the small change of Press and radio from the pens and lips of writers and statesmen of the United Nations.

When Germany attacked Poland on September 1st, 1939, it was an act of wanton, unprovoked aggression, as the term is popularly understood, by a large and formidably organised nation on a smaller and less well-equipped neighbour. The same spirit was observed in the Italian attack on Abyssinia, and, before that, in the Japanese assault on China. This short history of aggression resulted in the Tripartite Pact, with the three aggressor States plus minor satellites arrayed against the United Nations, who were quite determined to check such aggression and ensure that it never recurs. Recognising that aggression resulting in world wars is a very serious disease, are we likely to arrive at a remedy without being quite clear on the malady itself, with a good understanding of its causes?

Aggression is generally understood to be the unprovoked

attack of one nation upon another. Such a definition is true enough to the facts while being quite inadequate to the causes. It is necessary to examine more closely to ascertain what, if any, are the underlying causes of aggression. If it should be found that some natural cause or causes feed the springs of this world menace, then we are so much nearer understanding our illness and finding its remedy. What is underneath that "unprovoked attack"?

First, let us recognise the animal in man. Natural rivalry springs from our primeval origins, and it is far from being sublimated by any process of civilisation. Enmity and hate between men can develop from latent to active hostility given the occasion, such as mating desires or even the greed and inequalities of a fiercely competitive economic system. That men are natural enemies has been recognised and stated by many philosophers and writers, and it stands to-day as a psychological basis of all aggression. But remember this—that for many centuries civilising processes have been at work, and with sufficient success to make communal life in many large groups, or nations, progressively peaceful and fruitful.

Another primary cause is an ancient one, yet still capable of producing its drama to-day. It is the ambition of man, or a few men. Its expression to-day is found in the phrase "the militarist spirit," with Prussia and Tokyo as centres of residence. German Junkers and Japanese War Lords stand in the same relationship to Hitler and the Mikado as, no doubt, the barons did to William the Conqueror. In such soil and with such plants, aggression has little difficulty in flourishing.

But one man, or even a few men, cannot effectively move nations of fifty to a hundred million people to all the burdens of totalitarian war, as this century knows it, on personal ambition alone. Not the most magnetic dictator, with all the arts of propaganda, could achieve that. There must be other causes, based upon a mass of dissatisfaction. So we must look deeper.

To be offensive, to have the disposition to attack or to begin

WHAT IS AGGRESSION?

a quarrel, which is the dictionary definition of aggression, implies that one party has something which the other has not got, but desires. In the realm of personal contacts in human society, a bully does not possess the equable balance of a civilised, cultured mind. Feeling his inferiority, he is tempted to balance his loss with a display of pugnacious aggression. A simple example, but not adequate when we turn to nations organising themselves for total war. What is it that aggressor nations lack, but which their neighbours have?

In the complicated texture of a modern industrialised state—and all nations are developing their industries—the requirements of a people advance rapidly from the simplicities of food, drink and shelter to the amenities of car, steamship, railway or aeroplane. The elemental necessities merge with basic raw materials, forming the foundation of the degree of civilised life attained by a particular nation. Somewhere, within this framework, lies the shortage prompting a nation to aggressive action to relieve its need. It was not hard to find in the recent war.

If a man has adequate food, drink and shelter, he is a satisfied man as to the first essentials of life. Depending upon his state of civilisation and standards of life, he will need more in the form of amenities, but the first three he must have if he is to live. Any lack of these three essentials puts a man into a position where his will to live—and there is no higher expression of biological honesty than the desire of any living organism to continue that life as long as possible—prompts him to immediate action to repair that lack. Such a motive to action, imperative where the basic necessities of life are concerned, can apply in less or different degree where other raw materials of modern life are in short supply.

Here, then, we approach a valid test of aggression. Are these aggressor States, or any of them, in need of the essentials of life, to a degree that cannot be met by their own country's resources, so prompting them to look elsewhere? To find the answer we have only to consider the organisation of practically

all countries in the world to-day. For a man to live, he must work. If he has work, he has some command over the essentials of life. He can feed, clothe and shelter himself. Without work, or adequate private means, in the economic system now prevailing, he is likely to go short of his basic needs. Unemployment, therefore, is the test of such deprivation as will prompt a man or men in a modern state to listen to counsels of aggression, and finally to act upon them. It is not the sole cause, but it is nearly the basic one. As a man ascends in the scale of civilisation, as he obeys his natural impulses and accepts the responsibility of wife and children, so his needs increase and any lack of means to meet them prompts him to remedial action.

Accepting this test of unemployment, and applying it to Germany, Italy and Japan, can it be denied that it operated with overwhelming force in 1939? If several millions of able-bodied young Germans had not been left without work or hope of work in Germany between 1919 and 1939, would Hitler have found such fertile ground for blending Prussian militarism into national aggression? If Italy's sparse soil and natural resources were equal to the task of supporting her forty-five millions, would the Libyan and Abyssinian campaigns have been necessary? If Japan's islands could provide all that a hundred million Japanese require, would China have been invaded? In other words, these aggressor States have far too many people to support with inadequate means.

For confirmation of this view that hunger and want are basic causes of our modern wars, consider a broadcast to the American people in October, 1945, by Mr. Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture and chief United States delegate to the conference of the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organisation.

"Hunger," said Mr. Anderson, "must be eliminated as a primary cause of war. Two-thirds of the world's population was under-nourished, yet science and technology had advanced to such a point that the earth's agricul-

tural resources could fill the need of all. The atomic bomb meant that if another war came civilisation literally would be ruined, and the United Nations must not permit the pangs of hunger to bring about the basic fears and greeds which result in war. This United Nations' Agriculture Organisation would do its best to bring together countries that were hungry and those which were concerned with finding markets for their produce."

The Canadian Ambassador, Mr. Lester Pearson, speaking with Mr. Anderson on the same occasion, said the Organisation had a long-range job of helping hunger-ridden countries to increase their own production. *Unemployment and hunger after the first world war were the direct causes of the second world war.*

It is no answer to point out that other countries have an unemployment problem, but they do not seek to remedy it by attacking their neighbours. Britain's millions of unemployed between the world wars were kept from the borders of civil strife by the dole, or unemployment relief. As a nation, Britain was wealthy enough then to afford such payments to her unemployed, palliatives sufficiently high to ensure at least existence, sufficiently low to ensure that they did not compete with the lowest ranks of paid labour. America's unemployed millions between the wars seethed and fluctuated within the wide spaces of a vast country, but eventually even the United States of America had to meet the slump and threat of civil strife with New Deal legislation. Here, again, the nation was wealthy enough to meet unemployment with the expenditure of public funds. Other nations without such wealth meet unemployment with a miserably low standard of living on the border line of destitution, to the accompaniment of murmurings of revolt which threaten to erupt at any moment.

But although unemployment has been stated as a key to modern aggression, we must not accept it as the basic cause. Unemployment is an expression of economic organisation, or lack of it. Behind that expression is the overwhelming,

supreme fact that human beings are alive to constitute that mass of unemployment. If those human beings did not exist, no problem would exist. There would be no mass of human discontent and unsatisfied desires prompting huge numbers of men to envious and aggressive action against their neighbours. Not even a few bellicose militarists, not even a dictator's megalomaniac ambition, would then find the material for world wars of aggression.

It is this presence of enormous numbers of human beings, far beyond what many individual countries can support from their own natural resources, that must be emphasised as the chief cause of aggression in the world to-day. They do exist, they are with us here and now, and, what is more, they continue to increase in vast, uncontrolled surges of humanity, a fruitful cause of other wars of aggression unless the problem is faced by all nations and their rulers and a solution is found.

So when statesmen use the easy phrases quoted in the first paragraph of this chapter, are they spoken with a full realisation of the human factors involved? Is there a full and honest appreciation of the implications of aggression as we now know it in this troubled century? If there is a genuine desire to reach and remove the causes of aggression, then vast changes and new concepts of human life and arrangement are involved. To briefly indicate some of those factors, to touch upon the data and issues involved in any solution of the problem, is the purpose of the succeeding chapters. Sober understatement may check any sensationalism in the subject—it should not blind anyone to the realisation that human issues of the first magnitude are involved, affecting the chances of an ordered life for our race.

World Factors To-day

OUR world to-day is advancing at a reckless pace along the path that will lead to the precipice of the unsolved problem of human populations sharing and using the earth's resources in due proportion to their fluctuating numbers.

That path is being charted, developed and accelerated by the machine. Mechanical industrialisation gave man the disposal of the formidable power of the machine. It placed, and is still placing, enormous resources in man's hands, but it makes one pregnant demand. It demands labour in its service. Human labour serving a machine economy operating largely on profit-making motives has produced sweeping increases of populations in many lands in the past century.

The effect of the machine as a world factor to-day in population problems must not be under-estimated. Its obvious effects on reducing the times involved in travelling over the earth are summed up in the phrase that the world is shrinking. A more vital human effect, however, is to emphasise how the machine is compelling the unity of this earth. Frontiers and borders mean little when man uses the skies for his transport.

Examining more closely this influence of a mechanical industrial era upon human fecundity, some more conclusions present themselves. Recall for a moment a significant fact of the second world war, that to keep one pilot flying a machine in the air the services of some twenty ground staff were necessary. This is an illustration of what has happened with cumulative effect in many parts of the world during the last century and a half. A machine is invented. It requires human labour to make it. Once made, it works for man and quickly

makes its mark on the labour market. Often it displaces human labour, but quite as often, although it may not be immediately, it creates a demand for more labour. Eventually, and when its full repercussions upon the world market become known, the new machine gives employment to infinitely more human labour than it displaced.

Under the pressure of war conditions, aircraft manufacture in Britain became in 1943 the largest industry in the country. Similar increases occurred in Germany, the United States of America, Japan and other combatant nations. Visualise the total increase of human employment so created by the aeroplane and war in the world of to-day. Further, and this is the silent urgency of the matter, conceive what that full employment at good wages meant to millions of workers. Allowing for all adverse factors such as military service, housing shortages, food rationing, difficult transport (inimical influences on family life), is there not a balance on the other side, that the economic prosperity of such vast numbers of workers is bound to find a biological expression in increased fertility? An increase in birth-rates during the artificial prosperity of war-time is no new factor. America's births during 1943 totalled 3,200,000, an all-time record.

Leave the aeroplane now to remember earlier and similar effects upon human fecundity flowing from the invention of the machine. How many people in the world to-day obtain their livelihoods from developments flowing directly from Hargreaves's Spinning Jenny? Or from Watt's steam engine, or Stephenson's locomotive? Recall a more modern example, the discovery of wireless telegraphy and the range of employment it offers, from the manufacture of equipment to its use by a ship at sea in protecting life or the more dubious outpourings of a music-hall comedian "on the air." These examples are sufficient to establish the chain of cause and effect. Human discovery and ingenuity applied in the economic sense, results in the demand for more and more labour, with corresponding increases in populations.

But the matter cannot rest in that simplicity. Modern industrialisation involves urbanisation. More, on the economic principles hitherto prevailing, industry to-day is subject to periods of alternating booms and slumps, prosperity and adversity. So we have the position in many countries of large masses of people assembled in towns and living in such conditions that their numerical increase is a haphazard, fluctuating process governed more by mechanical invention and economic prosperity than by any concerted elements of scientific control or human judgment. Note in passing that unthinking masses of people crowded into towns are in the most vulnerable situation for attack or moulding by those two elements of irresponsible or, worse still, biased propaganda in the mid-twentieth century, the printed word of the Press or the spoken directives of the radio. Mass circulations of popular newspapers and the greatest agglomerations of loud-speakers reflecting the radio control of a country are to be found in industrial towns, not in agricultural areas. How soon in a modern aggressor's career does control of Press and wireless become necessary? Which is the more fertile soil for wars and revolutions, town or country?

It would be a valid criticism of any attempt to summarise large increases of urban populations as due only to the causes just mentioned, to point out that some other important world factors are involved. Unemployed masses or land-hungry races are made up of the sum of individual families, usually prolific. What is it, beyond the economic factor of employment, which causes some married couples to have no children while others will have up to a dozen or more? The answer is in natural fertility, combined with a standard of living or degree of civilisation. Here is a world factor in population problems of great importance.

To fully appreciate this factor bear in mind what has been said about the machine age compelling the unity of the world. Then consider how fluctuating fertilities will react upon neighbouring countries. If one highly civilised country is enjoying

an elevated standard of life with correspondingly small families, which means a declining birth-rate, and it has as a near neighbour a less civilised but naturally more vigorous and fertile race, will such a relative position remain constant? By no means, for Nature's imperative law of change and development will operate to alter it. Suppose, further—and this is quite common in the world—that the civilised country of declining or static population enjoys more space and more fertile soil and other resources than its more primitive neighbour of increasing population. Man's present political machinery will operate for a time to ensure that each group of human beings, or nations, will keep within its borders. But only for a time. Eventually, Nature's overwhelming principle of rewarding the fertile and penalising the barren will set in motion the movement for readjustment of populations and lands. Herds of wild animals answer this natural motive and principle by roaming in search of food and shelter. Men, or nations, answer it by peaceful emigration or violent wars, or, as the future may see, by an orderly, timely, repeated adjustment of population to lands and resources.

Another point develops from the facile communications of a machine age. Nations contact each other more and more easily. We are as yet at the dawn of this age of swift and easy transit between nations. With its development will come the opportunity of closer intermingling between the fertile and infertile races. With what biological result? Before one can answer that question the attention should be directed to other tendencies which will take precedence in time. Knowledge of and contact with other races and countries tends to diminish excessive nationalism. Political and economic differences, sharp in outline and pointed in disagreement while the contestants remain isolated within their home borders, tend to vanish and yield to negotiation when the parties visit each other. There is a call for a world language, be it basic English or not. Is not all of this part of that process of unity in a small world which has been mentioned as one of the results of a

machine age? We may note the approach of a closer-knit epoch, and have in our minds as a distant but approaching factor, that of intermarriage between races as one of the solvents of national population problems. Wedlock between visiting or invading soldiers and native women is no new phenomenon.

It is necessary to emphasise one negative aspect of this world process of population adjustment. There is little immunity for any nation, and there will be less as time advances and the machine charts the most backward or remote land. No nation can claim to be immune or apart from the inevitable increase in contact between all races. Australian aborigines at one time had little conception of what the white men would mean to their race. To-day, the Australians have had a sharp reminder that Japanese fertility is a menace to their undisturbed enjoyment of a vast continent. To take another example to-day of impact between nations. Iceland as a result of the second world war found itself acting as host to large British and American forces. Further, by reason of its geographical situation, Iceland is bound to play a large part as an air base in the future transatlantic air lines between Europe and America. Given another fifty years, a short time in human evolution, will not the year 2,000 see ample evidence in Iceland of Anglo-American contact dating from 1940?

Turning now to the factor of natural fertility, some broad conclusions will lead to another motif playing a large part in accretions of population. It is on obvious evidence that fertility in plant or animal is at its maximum in warm and hospitable climates; at its minimum in cold and bleak areas. The natural conditions for fertility will be found in those parts of the earth where sun, rainfall and soil support luxuriant growth, a statement which must be qualified with a proviso that extremes of climate in summer and winter, even a rather sparse soil, do not necessarily forbid a high birth-rate. Climatic extremes will be found in parts of Japan, while the soil of Prussia is not ranked as rich as many other parts of Europe,

but human beings reproduce themselves to no small degree in those lands. Nevertheless, it is to the warmer, more fertile lands that one must look for a facility in procreation that contains the germ of future population problems for statesmen.

Accepting that conclusion, it follows that the peoples occupying such areas will sooner or later have a density of population which needs only the additional factor of industrialisation to add the human spur to a natural impetus. Peopling such areas to-day are several of the coloured races, and some whites. In Europe, the Poles and Italians need little encouragement to multiply themselves on a standard of living inferior to many other European nations. In Africa the negro and other coloured races; in Asia, the yellow people; in America, the inhabitants of the central regions, more coloured than white; these are the groups enjoying the geographical tendency to higher numbers. In addition, they all live under another motif which, allied to natural fertility, makes a substantial part of the world's problem of human births. That motif is the religious one.

It is by no means insignificant that the races just mentioned all live under a religious belief which encourages, or does not discourage, the maximum degree of human fecundity. Poles, Italians and other Latin races of warm climates are loyal for the most part to the Roman Catholic form of Christianity, a creed which frowns upon any suggestion of human restriction to family increase. Notice that the Vatican's influence exerts itself in nearly all the countries of Southern and Eastern Europe where, between the world wars, populations with very little outlet increased by over 20,000,000. The black peoples of Africa or America live under either a purely pagan, tribal religion or a crudely emotional form of Christianity, neither of which encourages the least suggestion of human control or limitation of family. In India the two prevailing religions, Hindu and Moslem, exercise not the least restraint upon an accession of human beings that is reaching incredible numbers. The Japanese, living upon Emperor worship, docilely accept a creed which demands the maximum number of men and

women, to procreate and overflow all lands until the religion of the Rising Sun establishes itself as the world order its rulers intend it to be.

If this very brief summary of the religious factor of the more fertile races be correct, few words are needed to stress its importance. Simple minds under the sway or influence of priest or ruler will accept a degree of hardship, or in other words a reduced standard of living, which remains incredible to more civilised people. But it is a vital fact, and operative in the world to-day with great force. Put in the form of a contrast, a Swedish middle-class family with one or at the most two children will enjoy a standard of life far superior to an Italian peasant family with ten children. A French professor at the Sorbonne may decide with his wife that the study shall be undisturbed by children, while a Japanese engineer will go to his work in mine or mountain with cheerful acceptance of the burden of a family of six or more. Undoubtedly the Swede or Frenchman enjoys some material advantages, but the future may belong to the Italian or Japanese when their younger generations develop and expand into other countries.

Approaching the second half of the twentieth century, it may be questioned how long such religious influence will last, especially under pressure of the machine. While it may be difficult enough to find any god in the internal combustion engine, sceptical or materialist minds should beware of a too facile assumption that a little more time will level the inequalities in outlook and practice. Differences in colour and creed, supported by strongly held religious convictions, are not going to yield easily to mechanical progress. Nor will a high birth-rate descend to the level of a neighbouring low one on the exploding by a scientific discovery of a religious tenet faithfully held next door. Allied to religious support of human fertility is the warm instinct of all humanity that, be there a future heaven or no, the approach of death is mitigated for the fruitful and its pangs accentuated for the childless. Altogether, the religious motif in population problems is

pervasive and penetrating, and it will not be lightly exorcised.

Something has been said of militarism as one of the factors involved in national birth-rates. It is a matter of some wonderment that this exploitation of mass credulity by unprincipled adventurers, whether democratic politicians or totalitarian dictators, kings or commoners, continues to achieve the same success in the twentieth century as it has done through the ages. The common people of all lands, subjected to courses of propaganda or biased education, accept without question under a flag-wagging exhortation the physical task of rearing many duplicates of themselves, so providing the human material for later wars. The meek submission of millions of lives involved in the twentieth century's two major wars causes the impartial observer to wonder what supreme power has been given to the very few over the very many. The credulity with which the governed submit to the governors is no new spectacle in human history, but never before has there been such proof in terms of human bodies treated as physical pawns of little or no account. A German wife is exhorted to devote herself to kitchen and nursery, for the army must be strong. She does so, but differs little from the American or British woman whose economic prosperity encourages a large family. Or from the Japanese or Russian peasant whose vigorous natural fertility produces a teeming Asiatic population. The net result in all cases is the mass production of humanity.

To do justice to the rulers and governors of mankind to-day, the cycle of events may be viewed and stated in another way which puts militarism in a secondary light. This is the process. At a given moment a nation consists of a certain number of human beings. Enjoying thereafter economic or natural advantages which induce a high birth-rate, in a comparatively short time that nation may be increased in numbers by a fifth or a quarter. Then some of the economic or natural advantages fail. Unemployment results, but very often the impetus to the vigorous birth-rate continues for a period. The result

then is the presence of thousands or millions of human beings clamouring to their rulers for a livelihood, for work and bread. Unable to find livelihoods for all on the country's own resources, the rulers fall back on the favourite solution of the past, seeking it elsewhere, by force if necessary. War, therefore, offers to human rulers the solution or temporary side-stepping of the problem created by the presence of masses of citizens seeking a livelihood they are unable to provide by their own individual limitations. It is one of the touching facts of humanity to-day that the masses tacitly assume that because they have bred large families, work and bread should be found or provided for those children. Provided by whom? The Government, our rulers, is the answer. It is asking much of fragile human nature and ability, even where the rulers are actuated by the highest altruistic motives. It is an exceedingly dangerous request from the masses where their rulers are personally inclined to unprincipled adventuring or cynical combat. "Distract them with a war" is now becoming a costly solution by governments caught in the impasse created by their populations multiplying themselves beyond the full peace-time employment capacity of the countries concerned.

There should be no hypocrisy in the world to-day as to the so-called sanctity of human life. The twentieth century's wars and inventions have obliterated that spiritual value, and here, possibly, is our period's most profound tragedy. When Germany and Russia engage in a year of war which costs two million lives on each side, those four million deaths mean nothing at all spiritually in the daily routine of Americans and Argentinians. The mass demand for fur coats or jewellery or cinema seats in New York or London abates not a jot when another half-million lives are expended in war. The munition worker earning larger wages in war than in peace often prays that the conflict will continue, even though a family next door is losing its sons in the Atlantic.

Let us face this same issue in terms of peace. Because the motor car daily slaughters thousands of human beings on the

roads of the world in peace-time, is there any cry for the motor car to be abolished? No; humanity has made its choice. It will have the internal combustion engine or its successors no matter how high the price in human life and suffering. Now the aeroplane develops and demands its toll. The price is paid, unhesitatingly and without any real protest. Why? Because the machine, at this stage, spells what men choose to call progress. It solves the problem of speedy transport and, quite as important, it means employment. If thousands die as a result of the machine, it matters not provided hundreds of thousands transport either themselves or their goods, or earn their livings in making and maintaining the machines. That is the mid-twentieth century's scale of values in human life. Is it surprising that a mass-produced article has a mass-production value? Human bodies are very cheap, except to the individual mother.

Some National Features

VERY cursorily, but bearing in mind the aim to stimulate the common man's thought on this book's subject matter, we can glance at some national features touching aggression. This chapter will concern itself with some of the United Nations of the second world war, and the next with the three principal aggressors of the same conflict.

The British Commonwealth of Nations, where its white peoples are concerned, enjoys a relatively high standard of living. Social security is a rising factor. More and more the individual citizen looks to the State to buttress him from the ills and mischances of human life. Discernible in the life of these countries is an upward trend in the general level of intelligence, with an important population result flowing from this fact. The law of natural history is operating, where the rate of reproduction of a species is in inverse ratio to its intelligence. Where, as with human beings, a developing intelligence is allied with, or results in, a steadily rising standard of living, these factors operate to reduce the birth-rate. The individual exercises control; his acts are governed by premeditation.

Where such control is absent, or little in evidence, is in those classes of unskilled labour and poor intelligence whose normal occupations offer little chance of improvement. This, coupled with the natural urge and simplicity of the function of reproduction, gives the labouring classes the strong probability of a large family. The contrast, in this sense, between the labouring and the professional or higher classes in the British Commonwealth is sharp. Voluntary sterilisation by the more

gifted will in the long run result in their extinction, a gradual process but inexorable in nature. Some prophets of long vision have seen in this process the ultimate destiny—extinction—of man, a victim of his own intelligence, but such a stage is not a practical factor in twentieth century aggression. The facts just stated, however, are important as a background in assessing the fertility of the British white nations.

Twice within a quarter of a century the British Commonwealth has been called to war, serious war facing the strongest opponents, and the response from all the Empire Governments has been swift, unanimous, and affirmative. Why? Because the respective Governments of these self-governing countries have recognised a threat to their nations' possessions and life. Rather than submit to that threat, they preferred the way of defeating it by armed victory over the aggressor nations. Before passing to an examination of what it is in the British Commonwealth that these aggressive nations covet, note here that armed victories following a war are sometimes quite temporary affairs; they achieve little in permanence. All that the Allied victory in 1918 achieved was just this—that whatever the problem of that war, it was not to be solved by the desires and methods of German military domination. So with the second world war. Whatever its causes, armed victory for the United Nations means that the solution of those causes will not be on the desires and methods of National Socialists in Germany, Fascists in Italy, or the War Lords in Japan. But the basic causes will remain to be carried over to peace-time for solution. The peoples of the world should more fully realise and never forget this point. Wars settle little in permanence, short of Carthaginian sequels, or followed by that degree of high statesmanship shown after the American Civil and South African Wars.

Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, as the four principal members of the British Commonwealth, immediately rallied to the declaration of war by Britain in September, 1939. That established harmony of outlook and

opinion among the respective governments. It was a unity to defend a *status quo*; to prevent change by armed force. What was the position all British Commonwealth governments wished to defend? Briefly, not the independence of Poland, although in all honour that good reason applied with great force. British Empire statesmen, charged with the responsibility of taking the long view for the welfare of their states, knew very well that the thirty million people in Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand enjoy a living space of seven and a quarter million square miles. They also knew that three other nations, Germany, Italy and Japan, together had populations of two hundred and twenty millions compressed within a living space of about six hundred thousand square miles. Making every conceivable allowance for deductions of area due to arid desert, bare mountain, ice-bound waste or other reason, and for other deductions that the statistician would name, can the comparison between these two groups of nations be called other than impressive? What is far more important, with one group of nations reproducing themselves at a much faster rate than the other, all statesmen knew, and know now, that it is a position that is bound to change, war or no war. The pity is that they do not summon the honest courage to tell their peoples these hard, inevitable facts. Courage to tell an electorate unpopular truths goes ill with mass voting and party politics.

Britain, a little island, is densely populated with forty-five million people. It survives on imported food, although twice within twenty-five years by the most stupendous political folly it has come near starvation through shipping losses. Its mass increase of population dates, roughly, from the machine industrial era. As a nation it is a little more densely populated than Belgium, but, like its neighbour across the Channel, its economy is normally linked with an overseas system of colonies. Only by virtue of unimpeded human and commercial traffic between the home country and its overseas links do these two small countries, Britain and Belgium, survive with their

present populations. These countries are quoted as the supreme examples in Europe of a home agriculture being insufficient to maintain their large native populations, yet they have survived and grown by reason of their colonial links. In other words, even distant control of, or benefit from, adequate living space solves a nation's dynamic problem. Similar geographically small but densely populated nations without such overseas resources suffer great hardship, a much reduced standard of living approaching the point of hunger and an incessant strain which must, eventually, find its relief by substantial numbers of the population overflowing their borders.

Where Britain's national policy during the past century has been biologically suicidal has lain, not in the fact that financially cheaper food from abroad has been preferred to slightly more expensive home-produced food, but in the blind ignoring of the human equation. Fertility in human beings, as in all other forms of life, originates from and is directly related to contact with the earth. It may take several generations, but an urban population reaches sterility sooner than a rural people. So in terms of simple reproduction for the future of the race, Britain faces a biological crisis. Her hope of avoiding national suicide would seem to lie in a post-war policy of solving her unemployment problem by a back-to-the-land movement. "Three acres and a cow" has been an electioneering cry in the past. It has never been strongly postulated as a solution of urban sterility, but it is well worth such an examination. Putting first things first, life before property and finance, neither a barren sporting estate nor international finance, or shipping or other urban interest, should take precedence over the return of hundreds of thousands of young men and women to the land of their ancestors. If Britain is wise, and while there is just time, she will reverse the follies of over-industrialisation. A nation may survive once, or twice, but to risk a third time may be too much for Providence.

The fact that the United Nations in this war, either by virtue of their own space or that of their colonies, enjoy a

preponderance of the earth's resources is by no means insignificant *vis-à-vis* the aggressor nations. In to-day's language, the "Haves" face the "Have nots." The Atlantic Charter calls for a fair distribution of the world's raw materials. It will not require many years after the cessation of armed hostilities for the world to face the issue that if a price is to be paid for everything, with a profit attached to that price, some sharp difficulties will arise. In the world's present economic organisation, and with the United Nations emerging from this war with a victory of arms, the balance of raw materials and wealth will be even more against the recent aggressors. If the victors seek to perpetuate the present system, they will be asking profitable prices from nations less able to pay them than before the loss of a costly war. No solution to this same problem was found in 1919 onwards; will other methods be more successful in the second half of this century? Failure to solve it may well have annihilating effects the third time.

Of all the United Nations there is one which stands out for two reasons—its natural vigour and its economic system. Russia has earned much praise for its military valour and ability in this war, not least from many people in Britain who forget, or are silent upon, the important point that for a critical year Russia showed not the slightest sign of coming to the aid of Britain. But when Russia was attacked by Germany in a moment that history will adjudge as one of the supreme follies of any nation, then it was quite in order for Britain to forget the previous year and spring to her aid. No doubt self-interest demanded it, but the point is mentioned here in the hope that Britons, and all West Europeans, will develop great clarity of vision where Russia is concerned. It will be needed before the year 2000.

While the post-war years will probably intensify the world's interest in Russia's economic system, a more discerning outlook will point to the underlying significance of that great country's energy and boundless fertility. Recall that it is not the first time in human history that vigour and energy have sprung

from the East. History has known invasion from the East, always with an impetus that has required much to stem it. Russia in this war has lost many millions of population, but so many remain, and such is their abounding energy in a spacious, developing land, that an American statesman in the autumn of 1943 warned his countrymen that soon Russia would be a nation of two hundred millions. On present methods of population control, or lack of them, it will not stop at this figure.

This remarkable energy in Russia is allied to and serves an economic system which, whatever its other merits or defects, certainly inspires the average Russian to regard the country as his own, well worth dying for in a major war. That may be patriotism, but it is even better economics. It works, fully and with expansion, and that is more than can be said of some other economic systems of the world. If capitalism cannot solve its greatest, fundamental problem of unemployment, then capitalism is doomed. If the Russian system proves more efficient and serviceable to men's needs, then it will prevail. Probably the world will see the development of a system which is a blend of the two, but that it will be one, and one only, eventually in the world is already settled by that unity which results from the machine.

Speculation upon whether the twentieth century's third world war will take the form of a clash between Capitalism and Communism is not helpful; a more constructive outlook would approach the future animated by the desire to see the best made of both systems, eventually emerging, no doubt, as one. The average citizen of all lands has no desire to sacrifice his life in such a conflict, and he has every right to expect a more constructive alternative from his statesmen.

Russia has maintained a veil of silence, a barrier between West and East, which has been difficult to penetrate for Western peoples accustomed to freedom of Press and radio, but we have some information on Soviet policies since the German attack which is significant and important on her

population development. At an earlier stage in the Soviet's history divorce was simple and easy, with no difficulties in the way. With experience of severe war losses, however, Stalin authorised a complete reversal of this position. By a decree of July, 1944, divorce was banned, or made so difficult to obtain as to be virtually impossible for the average Russian, and a new scheme of taxation was imposed. This provided for special taxes on bachelors, spinsters and families with less than three children. Mothers with three or more children receive a money grant, with four or more children a monthly allowance, with five to six children the Motherland Medal, with seven to nine children the order of "Motherland Glory," and with ten children or over the title of "Heroine Mother." This reversal in policy was accompanied by an almost hysterical barrage of propaganda from the Soviet Press, to persuade the mass man and woman in Russia that such large-scale breeding is a worthy and laudable purpose in life, necessary and adding to the power and glory of their native land. No doubt it will achieve much of its intended effect, and in this sense it is no different from any other swarming population. But the parents in such lands should realise that large families on such methods are part of a technique of vassalisation which restricts the common man's chances in life. Eventually, swarming has proved to lead to overflow and conflict with early death for many of those mass men and women. Let it be recognised, however, that the solution is an international one, not for any nation acting individually. Russia, confronted with a swarming Polish, German, Indian, Japanese or Chinese population, is perfectly entitled to meet like with like. Is it here that we approach an acute aspect of the old tag about education running a race with catastrophe? Millions of common men in the world will be vitally interested in the answer.

Practically all of the Americas, but especially Canada, the United States, Brazil, and Argentine, represent that East to West movement of energetic or surplus people. Both North

and South America, for the most part, can date the bulk of their present populations from migrations or stock of the past hundred years. Illustrating the natural fertility of warm, hospitable climates, note that Brazil's population has doubled itself in less than a quarter of this century. In numbers, therefore, Brazil is set to become a world Power, if she so desires. However, numbers are not everything, and personal vigour and energy count for much. That is why races of the colder climates will often defeat in conflict or competition inhabitants of warmer regions. Europe has provided many examples of this in its unhappy history.

In the United States it is a source of pride that the country's swift development has flown from the pioneer spirit. Now a nation of nearly one hundred and forty millions, at its present rate of increase the United States will contest with Japan and Russia the third position to China and India in mass of population. The present numerical order of China, India, Russia, U.S.A. and Japan is not likely to alter as to the first two, but changes may be expected in the next three. It will depend upon natural fertility, economic prosperity which includes industrialisation, science, and national policy. The United States is favourably endowed for most of these requirements to population increase, and it does not lack the space to accommodate them. If any reader desires an example of what the United States of America can do in reviving life, replacing sterility with fertility, they will find an interesting one in the Tennessee Valley Authority. Here the human mind and will takes a hand; here we can see science and national policy at work. That these two elements are going to be supremely important in the world's population of the future may appear from the following chapters. The United States of America, and in fact all white races, will need to focus upon these aspects. New and vital powers are finding their way into men's hands, and many of these hands are coloured.

It can be said of the nations of the British Commonwealth and of the United States of America that the standard of living

enjoyed by their white citizens is so relatively high compared with other, and especially coloured, races that comparison is really difficult. When Hollywood exports its celluloid evidence of America's motor-car standard of living to impoverished, undernourished Indians and Japanese, the result is often a wry smile from the thinking Indian or Jap. But these same two nations, despite their poverty, continue a formidable increase in births, such an increase that it may one day penetrate to Hollywood's studios. Another example of a white man's insistence on what he has chosen as a high standard of living will be found in Australia. That country's policy in the last generation or two of deliberately excluding immigrants, especially coloured people, with a view to protecting the standards of labour in that interesting land, nearly brought it to ruin in this last war. There was a grave irony in an Australian Prime Minister's adjuration to his people, early in the conflict with Japan at their northern borders, to spend less on beer and betting and intensify their war effort. If that is Labour's standard in Australia, with a corresponding reflection in the numbers of their families, then truly it is only a matter of time. But since that remark, no doubt the tropical jungles and their yellow enemy have taught the younger generation of Australians some different values to beer and betting. No nation with Australia's space and resources can hope to hold that land indefinitely and exclusively for a population of less than seven millions, when coloured races to the north with modern equipment are multiplying themselves at a formidable rate.

To close this chapter, return to Europe for an interesting and tragic example of a great nation now in the throes of a population crisis, following a neighbour's temporary success in aggression. Long before this war French civilisation was threatened with decay, arising from several causes, but with one effect which need concern us here. The birth-rate had fallen to a level near to ultimate extinction. France had not the vitality to withstand her aggressive neighbour, and one

of Germany's most calculated, deliberate acts on the armistice in 1940 was to imprison nearly two millions of France's most virile manhood. That imprisonment in Germany lasted several years. With what effect on French family life and birth-rates? Obviously, an effect which may well add the final touch of fatality to that nation's future. The factors are not only separation, but malnutrition, illness, disease, affecting both prisoner and his relatives in France. Once more, we see the German realisation that people are vital, and that neighbouring populations to Germany in Europe must be reduced to comparative impotence.

It will need energetic, far-sighted and courageous statesmanship from France's leaders after this war if that nation is ever to recover the population it has lost. Science will help, but certain national faults, such as a selfish greed of money and, politically, absurdly frequent changes of government, stand in the way and must go. Even so, it is yet a little early to go all the way with General Smuts in his statement in London in December, 1943, that "France has gone, and if ever she returns it will be a hard and a long upward pull for her to emerge again." That the "upward climb will be a long and a bitter one" no one doubts, but France, as much as Italy and even Germany, cannot be written off so drastically while they remain entities of people numbering forty, forty-five, or eighty millions. Actual physical death is needed for such writing off, and with the aid of science an apparently hopeless position may be remedied. France may yet learn something from the French-Canadians but, above all, she must eradicate from her national life the cause or causes of the fact that at present only 28½ per cent. of her families now contribute to the maintenance of her population. Is money at the root of her abortion?

Three Aggressors

SOME brief facts concerning the three major aggressors of the second world war may establish the point that population figures very largely in those countries' motives and actions. Taking Germany first, when Hitler exulted that he controlled a nation of eighty million people, and one, moreover, destined to expand rapidly, he was very near the heart of his dilemma. That figure of eighty millions is derived from the compulsory incorporation of German-speaking States formerly independent, and other satellites, but as a figure it does express the weight and momentum of a vast, energetic mass of humanity in the centre of Europe. Experience of several major wars in the span of one century has not checked this German increase of numbers, and, unless special measures are taken by the United Nations, we must not anticipate any long-range check following the present conflict.

Germany is the one nation in Western Europe to attempt a full-blooded State control of its biological trend. This attempt dates most forcefully from 1933, with the advent to power of Adolf Hitler and his party. Sufficient statistical evidence has emerged from Germany during the war to indicate that battle losses of all types, civilian and military, have inflicted at least a temporary check on a birth-rate which rose from 14·7 in 1933 to 19·7 in 1938. A word of warning is necessary here. When some commentators point out that on the available evidence the German birth-rate for 1942 will be lower than any period between 1921-35, they are stating a fact which may be true statistically. But no sound conclusions can be drawn from that fact without making a comparison with Germany's neighbours

in Europe. Is the decline in Germany's birth-rate greater or less than that of France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Czechoslovakia or any other European State threatened by German expansion? If, as may well be the case when all the evidence is available, the German decline is less than her neighbours, then the original pre-war position of 1939 is altered, after the war, to one even more favourable to Germany. Europe in this sense must be judged as a whole, and the kernel of a troubled Continent is the Teutonic mass. For 1943, Germany claimed a total of births of 1,850,000.

Abhorrent as many of Germany's methods may be to civilised and especially religious minds, their efficacy must be faced. The docility of the German race in breeding soldiers for the army is unquestioned, but all statesmen, especially in Europe, must now concern themselves with other, and very grave, manifestations of the German intention to solve their problem of living space at the expense of their neighbours once and for all. The historic direction for German expansion has been to the East; the granary of the Ukraine has been long coveted. But any direction for military conquest is appealing to Germany, and she has shown some fair skill to the West and North in this war. Looking to the East, however, let us examine Germany's population methods with Poland and Russia. They may offer the conclusion that Germany, at least, knew her mind on this vital matter and was determined to achieve her end, win or lose the war.

In Poland the temporary conqueror pursued methods of the utmost brutality to exterminate physically millions of Poles, who occupied land in the direct path of German expansion. He slaughtered hundreds of thousands, with a special regard to solve what is called the Jewish problem by extermination. Where death was not relied upon, he has had recourse to sterilisation of potential parents. The explanation for this conduct indicates a settled policy by Germany's rulers that whatever be the military result of this war, the population result in all German-occupied Europe will be to leave no nation

THREE AGGRESSORS

with the numbers or virility to compete with Germany in the years to come. It is a harsh, bitter policy, but its presence confronts all other European governments, who may have to accept a *fait accompli* unless they oppose remedial measures at the peace table. It may be no exaggeration that Hitler talked of this war settling European destinies for a thousand years. And Germany's neighbours will need long vision and an iron, implacable resolve if they are to restore the balance in time. They may remember Hitler's own taunt, that the Allies after the 1914-18 war omitted to reduce the German people to an agricultural race of a few millions. Too many people in Britain fail to realise that a similar policy awaits this country whenever Germany has the opportunity to put it into practice.

Very similar methods to those in Poland were adopted by the invader in Russia. Extermination of the Russian population was achieved by several means. Local inhabitants in thousands were murdered on the spot, or deported to Germany where working conditions were conducive neither to long life nor procreation. Russian military prisoners were confined under such treatment that death for hundreds every month was a welcome release. These things happened on too vast a scale for any other conclusion than that they were part of a pre-meditated policy. They represented Germany's consciousness of a population problem, and indicated part of her method of solving it.

A State commission of Russian, French, Polish and Czechoslovak professors, reporting in May, 1945, on the concentration camp at Oswiecim (Auschwitz), in Polish Silesia, conservatively estimated that in the period between 1941 and early 1945 four million people perished at this extermination centre. Twelve thousand people daily were brought to the camp, and the five crematoria had a total capacity of 5,500,000 during the time they functioned. What possible conclusion is to be drawn from this except that here was Europe's most ugly, crude and sinister form of birth-control, applied by an aggressive nation geographically situated to be very well aware of the

pressure of human numbers in Poland and South-Eastern Europe? Deplorable as such treatment of human life is, can the world much longer evade plain answers to these four questions? After such large-scale extermination—even including all war losses—is Europe in any way short of human beings? Viewed biologically in relation to their national resources, should most of these victims ever have been born? If this is a recurring problem in human life, is the solution to be the extermination camp or an attempt at world-wide control by such wisdom as the human mind can provide? Has man any inherent right to multiply his species beyond his country's capacity to support? These questions cannot be shirked indefinitely, and in answering them, let us always remember the spiritual significance of these mass deaths to the mass man in other lands—which at present is just nothing. Yet the shadow of Oswiecim overhangs all our grandchildren on this planet.

The cry of old Marshal Petain, when France fell in 1940, "Too few children," sums up the fate of any State not sharing its neighbour's policy of a vigorous Government-encouraged birth-rate. Was not the same cry heard from Australia when the Japanese swarmed around Cape York? It illustrates the very soul of aggression in Nature and man—that the hungry many will invade to share, or take all, the preserves of the satisfied few. When German soldiers in France in 1940 stuffed their mouths with the luxury of butter, were they doing anything different in spirit to the Japanese seizing the oil and rubber and tin of Malaya and the East Indies? If the indignant answer of America, France, Britain and Holland is that Germany and Japan could have preferred butter to guns, let them think again of unemployment and want under inadequate systems of economy. How much butter could an unemployed German buy? How many family cars were run by the Tokyo factory workers? Did the democratic "Haves" quote specially reduced prices to the totalitarian "Have nots"?

Germany's attitude on the population question must be

judged not only by her vicious, brutal methods with neighbouring peoples in her path, but also by her internal policy. Within the past decade Germany has taken such drastic steps, in propaganda and more definite measures, that the impetus to population growth seems bound to survive the loss of this war. Marriage loans, family allowances, tax rebates, free holidays, reduced school fees, rents and fares, preferential treatment for parents of large families, settlements on the land, mating camps, closing of birth-control clinics, forbidding the sale of contraceptives, an intense campaign against abortion and venereal disease; these make a total which seem certain to have some survival value. Remember that over 1,270,000 German women are reported to have received Hitler's Gold Cross of Honour for being the mothers of eight or more children. The facile assumption that this and all other practices of National Socialism will disappear from Germany with a defeated Hitler should be expelled from democratic minds. There should be no illusion among the United Nations that if the principle of self-government is extended after victory, even after some years of armistice, to their present aggressors, they will most likely prefer a totalitarian form to any vestige of parliamentary democracy.

Turning to Italy, the ready natural tendencies to procreation needed only the spur of Mussolini's Fascism to bring the Italian population to a numerical level that is well beyond the country's own resources to support. Italian emigrants for generations past have provided a large percentage of migrant humanity, but when, in time, receiving countries instituted quotas or banned entirely the influx of such immigrants, a home problem rapidly developed for Italy. The 1914-18 war did a little to relieve matters, but Italy's share at Versailles never gave full satisfaction. Then a dictator appeared, and colonial expansion became Italy's practical method of relieving her human congestion. Eritrea, Libya, Abyssinia had their turn, to a constant accompaniment of Italian demands on France and the French Empire, and other parts of Africa.

Significantly as it proved, this Italian colonial expansion was achieved at the cost of meeting negligible military opposition. When Italy eventually did have to meet a first-class fighting Power in the British Commonwealth, she proved herself quite unable to hold by force what she had so easily gained. Italy lost her colonies, but her people remain as a present and future problem. When Mr. Anthony Eden, then Britain's Foreign Minister, was asked in the early autumn of 1943 in the House of Commons whether it was the intention of the United Nations to restore Libya to Italy, he replied with a terse "No." If, from that reply, one is to assume the same policy will apply to Italy's other colonies, the resulting position will be this.

By force of arms, Italy loses her colonies and is left with the home area to support her people. Hundreds of thousands of Italians, now held as prisoners of war or awaiting transportation home from the ex-colonies, will be returned to Italy after the war. Once home, they rejoin their brethren in the search for food and sustenance in a land quite inadequate to support such large numbers. Can any United Nations' statesman say that on those terms the present war has solved the problem of Italian aggression? Well may Count Sforza exclaim, in November of 1943, when he returned to Italy from America after the downfall of Mussolini, "What are we to do with forty-five million people in this poor country?" Perhaps the Vatican knows the practical answer. It remains as a peace-time difficulty with all the germs of future aggression unless that enormous population on inadequate soil is either reduced in numbers forcibly; a percentage transported elsewhere; or their support in Italy undertaken by other people. One cannot imagine on any capitalist basis other nations being willing for very long to grow food for and transport it to hungry Italians, except on terms of hard cash or its equivalent. How that cash will be found by a bankrupt Italy, and in what form it will be acceptable to those food growers elsewhere, is a repetition of history within this century.

THREE AGGRESSORS

Italy's population burden develops under and is influenced by the Roman Catholic system of religion. With the shadow of St. Peter over the whole country, and with a comparatively ignorant or credulous peasantry to influence, the biological fact must be faced by other nations that Italy will have a surplus of humanity to export for generations to come. Failure to receive those Italians, or omission to send food to Italy, or ignoring the position to leave the Italians to solve their own problem, will be no solution. A hungry Italian will fight. That is aggression. Another word in all fairness must be said on the religious motif in Italy. Advocacy of the principle of "The Lord will provide," and "Be fruitful and multiply," should be accompanied by a corresponding practical solution to the population problem it eventually creates. And if that solution calls into play the acceptance of the surplus population by other countries, then the receiving land is fully entitled to say if, and when, and no more. Ultimately, and with some limit to the earth's resources, does not control become inevitable?

It is when the observant mind contemplates the insidious expansion of the Japanese race since 1874 that one becomes most fully aware of the formidable power of Nature in serving a designed and deliberate human policy. Eventually, and owing to the world's prevailing financial and economic systems, Japan found herself forced to fight for her living-space and raw materials. But for that chance, or mischance, and on the principle of multiplying and occupying the earth, Japan was, and still is, well set for fulfilling its dream of the Rising Sun over all lands. To quote some evidence. Earlier this century Brazil imported Japanese agricultural labourers, numbering a few thousands. When Brazil came to declare war on the Axis in 1942, an internal difficulty arose from the presence of three hundred thousand Japanese in the country. The silent pressure of a high birth-rate. In the United States, a first concern after Pearl Harbour was the presence of over a hundred thousand Japanese in the Californian area. On internment, it was found that a Japanese chauffeur was

accompanied by wife and twelve children; a typical family. Canada's concern arose from Japanese infiltration into the Pacific islands and coast of that spacious land. The Pacific islands mandated to Japan after the 1914-18 war, even wide territories in the East nominally owned by other nations, awoke to find themselves peacefully occupied by the Emperor's subjects. Such is the penetrative power of large families.

For an even more ironic example of Japanese penetration, consider the position at Hawaii itself, the very scene of Japan's opening attack on America. Here, according to the most recent figures, out of a total population of less than four hundred thousand people, over one hundred and fifty thousand are Japanese. Many of these were born in the islands, so, technically, they are American citizens. They provide the cheap labour for domestic work, the sugar and pineapple plantations, the hotels and transport systems. They undercut white labour, and they speak more Japanese than American. Moreover, and this is the supreme factor, they continue to multiply themselves at a tremendous rate. With prosperity, and acting in family units, they are purchasing much of the best property in the islands.

To take another illustration, in the Philippines in 1900 exactly ninety Japanese were resident in the islands. In 1938, at Davao alone, there were 15,000 Japanese farmers and merchants, with swarms of Japanese fishermen operating off the coasts. Hard toil by these yellow immigrants converted untouched jungle into crop-bearing land, and this encroachment on the native soil led the Filipinos to fruitless protests and agitation in 1935. Government attempts to pass laws returning the land to the original owners were defeated by vigorous Japanese organisation and pressure from Tokyo. As one authority on Japan has well said: "That there are difficulties in the fulfilment of the precept that we should love our neighbours as ourselves no one would deny. Fecundity of itself carries no right with it to inherit the earth, and the mere

fact that the Japanese swarm is perhaps no reason why larger tracts of the world's surface should be given to them. Quality as well as quantity should be considered, but on this test a nation with the multitudinous gifts of character which Japan possesses is not to be given a low place."

Significantly, human fecundity cannot be dismissed as a "mere fact." It is the fundamental biological process. It leads to over-population, unemployment, distress and want, and eventually has forced the statesman to war.

To realise the view taken of human life and death in Japan, leave the slums of Tokyo, with a pressure of population per acre beyond most white people's conception, and consider the arrogant words of a Japanese admiral to an American listener well before Pearl Harbour: "We are prepared to spend ten million lives to get what we want in the East. How many lives are you prepared to spend to take it away from us?" Is that aggression? Further, would that aggression be physically possible without the mass manufacture of Japanese humanity to serve it?

With that in mind, recall some words of the late President Roosevelt, that the United States would not cease war until the Japanese had been driven back to their islands, where they belong. Granted they are so driven back, is that a final solution? Are the Japanese, once within their islands, to cease multiplying themselves at their previous rate? And bearing in mind that only about one-sixth of its land is suitable for cultivation, are the millions of Japanese so pushed back to support themselves from the islands' resources? Surely answers to these questions are necessary unless the speaker is to appear guilty of a futile statement. Granted that the United Nations' superior military, naval and air power would inflict defeat on Japan in this war, how will that armed victory be used to check the population growth of the defeated? It is a question which, if it appears irrelevant to Middle West or Eastern Americans, or to Britons, must vitally interest the thoughtful Australian or New Zealander. Here, truly, we do

face the vital issue of the second world war, that the armed victory of the United Nations will be purely temporary and ephemeral unless the ensuing peace terms either check the aggressors' growing populations, or make good and sufficient provision for their expansion. It must be definite check or expansion; pushing back is no solution. The tide will return.

That is why people of thoughtful vision read with much doubt the statement from Cairo in December, 1943, following the conference of President Roosevelt, Mr. Winston Churchill and General Chiang Kai-Shek, that Japan was to be stripped of all territories acquired by aggression. Such lands include areas like Formosa, seized in 1874, and many others in a long succession of attacks by the land-hungry Japanese. Admitting that the seizing by force of other nations' land is to be condemned, and that military victory will enable the United Nations so to strip the Japanese, is such a statement from three world leaders adequate as a solution unless it also makes clear what is to happen to scores of millions of living Japanese? Is the answer to Hirohito to be that a hundred million Japanese are to exist on the resources of the main islands of Japan? If so, does that promise peace? What force will be required to keep them there? Even *The Times* on the day of the announcement welcomed the statement as if it was a quite satisfactory solution of the problem; yet in the adjacent leader column that important newspaper emphasised the "fundamental inquiry" of Lord Simon's Royal Commission on Population Trends in Britain, closing that article with these words: "The problem of the birth-rate is by far the most important issue to which the Royal Commission will have to devote its attention. Nor is it an exclusively British concern. The same issue will one day call for the earnest consideration of all the United Nations, just as the very different but no less pressing population problems of China, India and Africa insistently demand concerted investigation and action on an international scale." "One day" is now.

The joint statement of the three world statesmen (Churchill,

THREE AGGRESSORS

Roosevelt, and Stalin) from Yalta, in the Crimea, in February 1945, was also silent on any specific reference to populations in relation to aggression. Yet compare this silence with some words of Marshal Stalin in November, 1944 :

“It would be simple-minded to think that Germany, after economic, military, and political disarmament, will make no attempt to regain her strength and embark on fresh aggression. History shows that a period of twenty to thirty years is enough for Germany to recover from defeat and restore her power.”

Just a quarter of a century to restore any depletions in her human stock?

Let us leave these three aggressors with a comment which has some relation to that natural enmity between men noted in the first chapter as one of the underlying causes of aggression. It would be over-simplification to dismiss all of their aggressive actions as due only to over-population. Of Japan, Germany and Italy, only in the case of the Italians can one ascribe most of their aggression to such a cause, with what tinge of militarism a few brief years of Fascism produced. With Japan, there is the gravity of a dark feudalism, a degree of isolation from Western Civilisation and utter contempt of human life, which colours that nation's aggression. But it is in Germany one finds a deep spiritual sickness, resulting in repeated and ever more brutal attacks upon their neighbours in Europe. This is more than the movement of hungry people seeking food. Hitlerism, Kaiserism, Bismarckism, even beyond into the past centuries, the sickness of German aggression has been much the same, with death and worse for her European neighbours. There need be no fine distinctions drawn between these political periods or systems in Germany, for none exists. On each occasion, at the dominating control of aggressive individuals, the mass of the nation has supported and co-operated in military adventure. Nations fortunate in the possession of a sea barrier from Germany should not refuse to indict a nation; they should make the imaginative

effort to visualise themselves as land neighbours to that State. Only first-hand experience of a German armed invasion fully qualifies a nation to assess Teutonic aggression. How to remove from the German race that deep-seated enmity to its fellow men is much of the problem in finally closing their long record of cruel attack in Europe.

5

Colour and White

IN order of numerical dominance, the yellow races lead the white, with the black, brown and red peoples as runners-up in that order. Before passing to any more detailed comment on these races and their biological trends, it is helpful to have in mind a picture of this earth in relation to its human population. There are about 55,214,000 square miles of land area on this planet. Of this space, the British Dominions occupy 14,000,000 square miles; Soviet Russia controls 8,176,000 square miles; the French Empire has 4,336,000 square miles; the United States of America has 3,750,000 square miles; Brazil has 3,220,000 square miles; and China 3,000,000 square miles. This makes a total of 36,482,000 square miles controlled by only six major sovereignties, with a balance of 18,732,000 square miles to be shared between all other nations, including the three heavily populated aggressors of the second world war, Germany, Italy and Japan. All figures are from 1939 and take no account of this war's temporary fluctuations.

Inhabiting this planet are estimated to be some 2,150,000,000 people, with about half of them in Asia alone, and nearly 400,000,000 in Europe. This approximate total, true of 1939, compares with a total of about 1,875,000,000 in 1929. That means an increase of some 275,000,000 in one decade. The rhythm of this rate of increase may well support an estimate that, assuming the earth can support a total human population of 6,000,000,000, this figure will be attained in the year 2100. Observe that this optimum year is little more than a century and a half away. Only one hundred and fifty years before humanity has nearly trebled its numbers. In a time sense,

that is almost to-morrow. Is it any wonder that here and now, half-way through the twentieth century, we are experiencing world wars and vast upheavals of humanity? The human race will need a far more scientific, better controlled, and less selfish system of economy than the self-interest and natural liberty of Adam Smith if it ever hopes to cope with the food and shelter requirements of such masses of people.

As practically half of this world's population is to be found among the coloured races of Asia, we can turn in that direction for some evidence on the trend of their numbers and areas. In that vast continent the country to arrest attention at once is India. Speaking in London in September 1943, as Viceroy-Designate of India, Field-Marshal Lord Wavell said:

"It is an alarming thought, when one considers the problem of India, to realise that every month, at the present rate of increase of the population, there are an additional 300,000 to 400,000 to be fed, educated and cared for."

It is difficult to visualise such an increase in numbers as three hundred thousand a month, but it may help to picture what this involves to recall the Bengal famine of the autumn of 1943. Hundreds of the poorest classes lined the streets of Calcutta and other towns, to die of starvation or be relieved just in time to preserve life if not health. Where is the majesty of man in this spectacle? "What a piece of work is man," cried the poet, but he was not addressing himself to the emaciated evidence of that work lying cheek by jowl in the streets of India with sacred cows not suffering from malnutrition. Should humanity reproduce itself in such numbers on such terms?

Undoubtedly India's population must check and recede, or grow and expand beyond its overcrowded home area. Indians have emigrated, but notice one result of their movement abroad. East Africa offered some scope for development, an adjacent land to India across one sea. Indians settled there in increasing numbers, and eventually began to buy the land

that represented home to them. This land-buying by Indians continued until the African Government became alarmed, and passed anti-Indian land laws. This is a temporary check on the settlement of Indians in Africa, but it doesn't solve the fundamental problem of India's over-population. How far off is the stage when pressure of numbers causes Indians to resort to aggression? Tension between India and South Africa on questions arising from immigration of Indians into East Africa reached an acute stage in 1944, and is not yet settled.

Lord Wavell's alarm at the uncontrolled increase in this coloured population may be shared by every thoughtful citizen of the world. He speaks at a time when self-government for India is claimed and may be granted. British rule may not have equalled the magnitude of the task, but one may well hesitate at the possibilities of strife and death involved in a wave of nationalism sweeping a country whose population increases by over four millions a year. Be it the clamour of mob rule, the clash of religions, the feudality of ruling Princes, the corruption of politics and commerce; in all or any of these aspects of self-government, India's vast population remains as problem and too often as victim.

India's neighbour, China, can disperse a slightly larger population in a much larger area, so the density of people per square mile is not so acute as in India and Japan. But the comparative insignificance of individual human life in Asia needs no emphasis from high death-rates, epidemics, floods, famines and other catastrophes involving thousands of lives each year. It is not open to the white races to cast any stones, in view of recent events, but on a comparison of all factors affecting the average longevity of man, the East has yet to equal the West. Nature's disasters and handicaps to life in crowded Asia receive the further stimulus of human depravity. Thousands of peasants will be forced from their land and die of starvation because merchants and middlemen have cornered the grain. Iniquitous debt passes from father to son, with family lives mortgaged. The moneylender thrives. Elementary

measures to safeguard health meet the bigoted opposition of priest and ruler. Yet despite all handicaps the Asiatic population grows. If lands under white control refuse them admittance, what is to be the solution in another half-century, or sooner?

For another aspect of this racial question between the coloured man and the white man, but one which although not solved is not yet acute, we can look to America. In the United States there is what is called the negro problem. The coloured population of that country has grown from about four and a half millions in 1860 to about thirteen millions in 1940. An increase of almost three times in eighty years. During the same period the white population of the United States has expanded far more rapidly, but no comparison between the two colours can be made without full allowance for the heavy immigration of whites during the eighty years. It would be a difficult study, but very valuable, and we may hope one day to see a fresh scientific examination of all the data available after this war and merely hinted at in this little volume. It is in the United States of America especially that we would ask the research worker to ascertain the statistical and other facts concerning population and intermarriage between the many races who now comprise that variegated nation, not excluding negro and white. It is from the United States of America that the world will learn much on the ability of races to live together and share a common land. In that exhilarating country to-day within three generations of a family there may be Swedish and English grandparents, with sons and daughters married to offspring of Austrian Jews, Germans, Italians or Irish; and grandchildren marrying in their turn partners from yet different stock. It seems to work.

The world will also watch that sturdy country to observe its solution of one of the economic, and aggressive, foundations of the recent American-Japanese War. Impelled by that vigorous pursuit of profitable self-interest which is the keystone of the country's business life, the Americans did not hesitate to sell

millions of tons of scrap metal to Japan in the years just before Pearl Harbour. With war, United States' surgeons had the task of removing some of that same metal in the form of bullets and shrapnel from the bodies of young American manhood. The fathers deliberately sold, knowing their coloured customers were arming for aggression, and surely suspecting that eventually some of that metal might penetrate the bodies of their sons. Is that the ethical level of the profit motive? It doesn't make much sense to an observer.

What has been written on the interrelations between white and coloured people in America—and there are bound to be contacts of some sort where people share a country—may apply equally to Africa. Here racial questions are sometimes acutely controversial; in other instances the races have a working toleration which encourages development. Africa, however, has a special significance for statesmen of several nations. It is regarded as one of the undeveloped continents, which means in practice that over-peopled lands will look to it for their expansion. Already large sections of it are claimed by connection with Britain, Belgium, France, Portugal and other nations with substantial home populations, and the inter-connection has an important influence on their economic life. With other nations knocking at Africa's door, a severe test of statesmanship is approaching. Protection of the native coloured races' interests will be a first consideration; super-imposed will be the demands of outside peoples. It happens that several European nations have a genuine flair for handling backward native races, when actuated by altruistic and not selfish motives. To develop Africa is one thing; to exploit it is quite another. Whatever the approach, however, it is on the African Continent that we shall see during the next hundred years one of the largest and most interesting fusions of mixed humanity. The South African Government are now engaged on considering a number of problems affecting the post-war development of the natives *pari passu* with the white peoples, and any move from outside touching this continent

must take account of the views of this British-Dutch Cabinet.

Not to underestimate the African problem, however, some figures of present population ratios will convey their own significance. Nyasaland has 1,670,000 negroes to 2,000 Europeans. Tanganyika has 5,243,000 negroes to 8,000 Europeans. Kenya has 22,000 Europeans as against 3,500,000 negroes and 47,000 Asiatics. South Africa has just under two million Europeans compared with about six million coloured natives. Exact registration and census of all native coloured races does not apply throughout Africa, but the disproportion in numbers is self-evident. It is reasonable to assume that fertility amongst the negroes exceeds that of the whites, a fact to remember against another one, that, on the whole, the best land and the controlling positions are occupied by the whites. Literacy amongst the natives is very limited, but it is slowly growing. Also developing is the fact, British inspired, that full emancipation for the black man is to be a cardinal policy for the future. Give him time, and the black man will not always be a labourer. And, in principle, this will apply to other coloured races north of the Equator. Also, the coloured man will not be refused the benefit of the white man's science, whether it be in health services for himself or attacking a virus killing his cocoa plants.

From this brief glance at the coloured races is any conclusion to be drawn by the white peoples? Biologically, they must recognise that the coloured races are more prolific. In so far as this increase concerns the Asiatic races—and undoubtedly the pressure is from that direction—it will demand control or expansion. The latter will mean aggression unless it operates on an agreed, peaceable plan. Other factors besides natural fertility have to be considered. In what are known as the arts of civilisation, much better expressed to-day as the range of scientific knowledge, the white races lead the coloured and so have a great advantage. Politically, the whites also lead, but the blind devotion of some Eastern peoples to their rulers results in a unity of motive and action not to be underestimated.

Ultimate conflict between the white races as such and the coloured peoples as a mass seems remote, but it is not impossible. Its avoidance will demand a wise recognition and forestalling of the danger, a task for statesmen of the next century. The governing factors will be pressure of population in relation to subsistence, comparative scientific attainments, and degree of industrialisation. The East can be quick to learn from the West; it can apply those lessons with a zeal, speed and devotion which can bring sharp results.

Science Takes a Hand

IT is necessary to glance at one more factor in life affecting human populations. Man's powers to-day, already formidable and gathering swift momentum, arise from the growth of his scientific knowledge. The influence of science upon aggression, expressed in terms of nation assaulting nation, is now profound and will develop enormously in the next hundred years. This does not refer so much to applied science like radiolocation, although such discoveries are important enough, as to the effect of science upon the living man, the unit of population in aggressor States or attacked nations. Science, not religion, promises to be the solvent of the future in relation to populations, and it will be a convenient division to consider its effect first on the destruction, then on the creation, of human life.

Total war, one of the smooth phrases of the recent conflict, calls upon science for the aeroplane, the atom and other bombs, the mine and torpedo, quick-firing and ever more powerful artillery, the machine-gun beyond Maxim's conception, the rocket, even poison gas. With such assistance, nations face total war confident that they can impose casualties running into millions. War is no longer the preserve of the professional fighter; it is shared by every civilian. If he is not in the front line of attack, then he and his wife work in field or factory with the daily expectation of obliteration by bombing. Casualties in this second world war for several of the contestants have exceeded the previous war's losses. Altogether, science can claim that it has given men excellent destructive power, and man has not hesitated to use it. We have yet to test this possibility, which occurred after 1918. Nature, as if

jealous of man's puny efforts at destroying life, swept the world with an influenza epidemic which cost more lives than all the battle casualties. In view of this war's destruction in Europe and elsewhere, there are grim possibilities ahead should Nature repeat her gesture.

In modern wars the question becomes: Does the creation of human life outstrip the destruction of it from man's lethal use of his scientific powers? The answer depends, of course, upon the scale of the fighting, in its broadest application. Not even German or Russian virility could withstand many years of the bitter battles fought in summer and winter on the steppes of Russia. Nor could a civil population withstand a decade of regular activity by an Oswiecim crematorium. On that scale, with millions of casualties a year, destruction outpaces creation. If we note the tendency for wars to become ever more costly in human life, and if we remember the oft-repeated warnings from statesmen of a third world war in another twenty years after the conclusion of the second, then it would seem likely that the twentieth century is going to hail man's destruction of life through his use of science as the grisly winner. We are fairly faced with the issue, and the answer is by no means certain.

There can be little doubt that the aggressors in this recent war, especially Germany and Japan, displayed a real determination to make it an expensive conflict in life for their enemies. Germany's ruthless annihilation of many thousands of Dutch lives even after that country's surrender can be matched by Japanese slaughter of scores of thousands of Chinese in air raids on unprotected towns. These are typical examples of the view of human life taken by modern aggressors with scientific weapons in their hands. An iron-hard appreciation of the vital issue involved—sheer national survival—seems to exist most clearly in Russia, who met her enemy accordingly.

Writing at a moment when full statistics of the second world war's human losses are not yet available, one can still

gather a fair idea of the position from the following. Mr. Attlee stated in the House of Commons in October, 1945, that he estimated total losses of German armed forces in killed, permanently wounded and permanent medical casualties between September 1st, 1939, and May 10th, 1945, were 7,400,000. Keeping to the point of comparison between destruction and creation of human life through the agency of science, we can first compare this German figure with that of her enemies, i.e. her neighbours. Including Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Denmark, Holland, France, Belgium and Britain, losses of the same type in the armed forces of these countries exceed ten millions. On such a contrast, the balance is not disproportionate. However, one must include civilians, and here as yet statistics are even more inadequate. But recognising the vital importance of the fact that civilian casualties in scientific wars tend to equal or exceed those of the armed forces, we can form an estimate of the European position as it stands at the new dawn of peace. German policy in this respect emerges with some degree of success as against her neighbours. Allowing a rough figure of three millions as total German civilian losses arising from five years of air-raid casualties, deaths amongst the very young and old from illness, expulsion from homes, epidemic fatalities, and other war causes, one must compare this again with her neighbours' loss in civilian life. If we start with the figure of four million forced deaths in Oswiecim, and add to that the high figures for Russia's civilian losses (conservatively put at ten millions) and all the nations surrounding and opposing Germany, a total of seventeen millions or more is involved. On the German side, therefore, a grand total of about ten and a half millions of loss of life compares with some twenty-seven millions of losses by her opponents. Nothing like strict accuracy is claimed for these figures, but the proportions involved are fairly stated, both as between armed forces and civilians and between the contesting nations. Whether, on this comparison, Germany emerges from the war as the ultimate winner or loser on a population test

with her neighbours is, it is again suggested, almost the most vital issue. The final answer cannot be given here at this stage. It must be left for the emergence of more accurate and complete figures in several years' time.

In answering the next question, basic to this chapter, whether this forced destruction of nearly forty million lives exceeds the creation of life by the same nations within the same period, permission will be asked of the reader to approach that answer in a manner that the statistician again would rightly condemn. In other words, let us leave the incomplete statistics of war-torn Europe to enlarge our view of the whole problem as it will develop in the future. Let us recall in imagination the explosion of those two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan in August, 1945. With those explosions humanity finally launched itself into the new scientific era, and we must accept some recent words of Britain's Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, that war in an atomic age is certain suicide for the nations. Note, however, as regards human life, that this statement is based upon a threat of future destruction, rather than upon achieved results, for the 100,000 or so deaths in these two Japanese cities are puny compared with the achievements of Oswiecim. Before making some assessment of the influence of atomic energy on human life, let us all have its importance indelibly stamped on our minds by these significant words of Sir John Anderson, spoken in September, 1945, as chairman of Britain's Advisory Committee on Atomic Energy:

"A world peopled by men who have atomic energy at their disposal is bound to be quite a different place from the old world with which we are so familiar. The development calls for nothing less than a complete readjustment of all international relations and for the framing of a new order of society. What is of vital importance is that the nations of the world should get down to this problem without delay. If there is delay, incalculable mischief may be done. . . . It is true that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. But

that law is subject to one very important qualification: it is subject to the time factor. The equal and opposite reaction that may eventually produce balance may take time before it has exercised its full effect. It is just in that time lag that the danger arises. . . . What an opportunity is provided if only we have the courage and the wisdom to grasp it."

Returning now to the connection between atomic energy and human life, why has a threat to use it succeeded so spectacularly in stopping the Japanese War? Because, on two demonstrations, its potential for utter destruction was incontestably established, and the Japanese Government recognised at once that a few score of such bombs on their mainland would dispose not only of property but of people. The nation would cease to exist. They were caught in the time lag mentioned by Sir John Anderson, with no effective reply to the Americans' superior but perhaps ephemeral balance of power. So, answering now the question whether with the aid of science in modern war the destruction of life does exceed creation, may we call upon a draft of the future and say that, in the absence of the successful counter-action to atomic military weapons, the reply is undoubtedly yes. Whether America can really pride itself on a permanent and victorious solution to her recent conflict with Japan may be estimated from some picturesque words of Admiral Halsey, one of her naval leaders, that the only thing wrong with the defeat of Japan is that it has come while too many Nips are alive. But it was very significant that almost coincident with the arrival of General MacArthur in Tokyo, commercial representatives of American industry stepped from their planes, prepared for immediate business with the defeated. Leaving aside the little point of the shortness of human memories, and the commerce between America and Japan in scrap metal before the war, it is of some future significance economically to wonder whether these prompt carpet-baggers expect their humbled Oriental customers to pay prices showing the same vigorous profit

margin normally attached to American goods and services? If it is to be part of America's future policy to wield the atom bomb in one hand and offer a commercial catalogue of strict cash business with the other, then even a scientist's eyebrows may rise at such an alternative. They may fall again at the recollection that Japan has concluded this war with most of her vast population intact. It will then be the turn of the economist to ponder on the reconciliation of the living demands of these Japanese people with profitable carpet-bagging and General George Marshall's overwhelming confidence in scientific power when, reviewing the world war as America's Chief of Staff, he declared that "nations must be forced to respect our peace."

In war to-day, therefore, man's use of his scientific powers may destroy rather than create life. In that process, applied science would appear to be restoring the balance to some extent, for in periods of peace there is no doubt that modern research puts enormous emphasis on creating life. It aids Nature in adding to life in peace; it takes from life in war. But the balance is not an equal one. There is a heavy margin in favour of the peace-time addition to life, as we shall see, and in that science intensifies the root cause of modern aggression.

Against all the obvious wastages of human life in peace-time from the application of scientific discovery, like motor-car casualties and other machine losses, there must be placed the saving of life from beneficial applications. First and pre-eminent, the devoted work of medical science adds enormously to the total of human life. Health services and sanitary precautions give a rising standard of physical life in civilised countries. Such discoveries as the malaria-carrying mosquito by Ross, insulin by Banting, penicillin by Fleming, and many more, add a vast total to the sum and quality of humanity. It is a process of research and discovery which continues unceasingly in all progressive lands; beneficent, noble work, adding to the majesty of man.

Next to medical research may be placed the inventive or

mechanic sciences, concerned to save life, whether it be the miner underground, the traveller at sea, or the housewife in her kitchen. Spectacular discoveries, like the wireless telegraphy of Fleming and Marconi, may be matched with the less obvious work of the agricultural research station, say at Rothamsted. In the one case it is saving life by direct rescue; in the other it is adding to the means of life by deeper understanding and control of plant life in the soil.

Let us return here to the age of atomic energy, now dawning before mankind. So far we have witnessed its use for destructive purposes only. What of its constructive uses? Can any clear-sighted observer doubt that this vast new source of energy is destined to revolutionise human life? Applied atomic energy will shatter economic systems based upon the human degradation of the coal mines, the use of animals instead of machines, scarcity instead of abundance, domestic labour approaching slavery. It will herald a clash between scientist and financier, but the statesman will find no escape from his basic responsibility to the mass of his people, so eventually the common man will find his life transformed by this new application of science. A life relieved of drudgery, with plenty instead of scarcity, is likely to add to life rather than detract from it. So this profound discovery, creatively applied, takes a high place as one of the future savers of human life. Our numbers will increase from its benevolent applications.

We must not shirk one very hard fact on this supreme problem of the control and handling of human populations. There is a vast gap between the standards of advanced human thought and the practice of traditional life. In other words, the few who read books or exercise their minds and think clearly, with some control of their lives and actions, contrast with the prolific masses whose lives for generations are a repetition of physical existence and little more. How is this gap to be bridged? In the writer's judgment, the closing or diminishing of this gap is one of the basic issues before mankind. While it remains so widely open, the most real

danger exists of the unscrupulous, the distorted, even the well-meaning but inadequate among the few, seizing the power of man's discoveries and inventions to wield death and destruction over the dumb many. Or, put more briefly, war will once again be an instrument of faulty statesmanship. It is not a matter of levelling down the few to the many, but of raising up the masses to levels of quality above quantity.

There is some promise of success in raising the life level of the common man, if on a foundation of international approach we use to the utmost such means of education and persuasion as modern discoveries permit. It involves, however, an honest realisation that the task is one for the scientist-statesman. If this sounds like a new breed of supermen, the answer is—not so. What it does imply is a recognition that human life on this planet has now become so involved and interwoven, that the old methods of political control and government are outdated and obsolete. So a new approach is called for. There are signs that the demand will produce the supply. Bear in mind the world-wide reverberations of the discovery and use of atomic energy. What is the most significant development of the atom bomb so far discernible? It is that scientists themselves, fully aware of the tremendous implications for good or ill of their discovered power, are now raising their voices for a share in its control. They have every right to a large share. In fact, they are best qualified to gather many of the reins of human government into their hands. The world will be the better for more intelligence and less emotional passion that is so often allied to ignorance and superstition.

Because it is fairly indicative of the ceaseless quest of science to add to the sum or quality of life, but also because it contains the germ of a most formidable element in future aggression between nations, attention must now be directed to a conference of the British Association held in London during the 'air raids. It was called to discuss the post-war reconstruction of European agriculture. Dr. John Hammond reported to the conference on recent developments in animal breeding in

Britain, to raise the standard of live-stock. Describing the remarkable results achieved by artificial insemination, he said that a pedigree bull in Russia, which would normally sire between thirty and forty calves a year, had by these methods sired 1,490 calves, while a single ram had sired 15,662 lambs.

"Problems of transport, which have so greatly impeded the grading up of stock, vanish," Dr. Hammond said. "A ram at Cambridge has been mated with a ewe at Warsaw, and a bull in England with a cow in Holland. With fast air transport it should be possible by these methods to spread the best lines of live-stock cheaply throughout the world after the war. The best strains can be put at the disposal of small farmers at very little cost."

Mr. A. J. Drexel Biddle, then United States Ambassador to the Allied Governments in London, suggested that artificial insemination would play a big part in re-establishing stocks in Poland and the "scorched earth" areas of Russia. British, American and Canadian agricultural organisations could supply the breeding stocks for those areas. Agricultural research then being conducted on both sides of the Atlantic might save thousands of people from starvation at the end of the war.

Here is science applying artificial insemination to the animal world, to serve human ends. Can and will it be applied to human life? If so, does it bear at all on the question of aggression?

The answer to the first question is that it can be applied to human life, and is, in fact, already in practice in various parts of the world; on a limited scale, however, and usually to meet the circumstances of childless couples whose marriage cannot otherwise be made fruitful by medical science. Britain has a Family Planning Association (in principle, such a body is imperative in all countries as the twenty-first century draws near, operating on wide, scientific and statesmanlike policies) and this Association reports that under appropriate medical supervision a small number, around one hundred, children have been born in Britain from artificial insemination.

America has advanced upon this; in that virile land the figures exceed 50,000.

Answering the second question, our Western world must face realities in this and similar matters, or it may stumble. Europe for many generations in its leading countries has possessed what are generally known as some cherished principles of civilisation. High on the list is the treasured institution of the family, based upon marriage and the home. Here is civilised man's dearest possession. Any threat to the foundations of family and home finds instant opposition from Parliament, Church, Press and the man in the street. That artificial insemination does contain such a threat, in its very nature, cannot be denied, and for this reason alone, in all normal life circumstances, it will not be adopted on any major scale by a civilised country for human life.

But are all nations equally civilised, and is life always normal? Nations differ profoundly, and here is the bearing upon aggression. In the hands of a fanatical race, like the Japanese, or even a numerous type of German, this scientific use of artificial insemination on human beings might be adopted on a wide scale with grave results for the future of mankind. It could and might be used in the following abnormal circumstances.

If, as a result of successive wars within short periods of time—twenty years or so—belligerent nations find themselves with numerous women of child-bearing age deprived by war casualties of their male partners, the birth-rates of those countries will decline. Given sufficiently frequent and expensive wars in male human life, that decline might well reach a suicidal level. With the successful and widespread practice of artificial insemination, however, this adverse result on the birth-rate is avoided. The inherent danger in the position is that one or a group of belligerents so placed may resort to such a means of maintaining its numbers, while others, prompted by one or several scruples, would refrain from such methods. In such circumstances, the balance between the

nations is uneven, and another threat of aggression is born.

It must be recalled here that some important European nations, as a result of two major wars within twenty-five years, with heavy casualties amongst their young men, are in the position to-day of having two generations of many sterile women. What is their biological future? Any suggestion that artificial insemination on a concerted scale should repair the hiatus would be received with horror in Western civilisation, but do not ascribe similar compunctions to other races. A nation like the Japanese, drilled and regimented in every phase of life to an unquestioning belief in its destiny to rule the world, may find a very different response from its unmarried young women desiring children.

Little more need be said to awaken the vigilant attention of all far-seeing people of Europe, and the white world, to this most pregnant contribution from medical science affecting populations, and so aggression. The spectacle of white races decimated by costly wars and failing to reproduce themselves, while coloured races survive such wars with undiminished numbers, perhaps as a result of artificial insemination, is not a comforting one. It is stated baldly here as a contrast of white and colour. There may be permutations of that—some white nations have a ruthless regard for science and all its wonders.

It is worth while here to examine the policy, not too openly avowed, of two at least of the United Nations in this second world war. That policy by Britain and America was to use money and machinery in overwhelming power (i.e. applied science) to conserve human life. Here is a very valid recognition that a nation at war to-day does fight with its all—man, woman, and child. These are the fundamental assets of any State, so their conservation is vital. On this policy Britain succeeded in reducing her man-power losses in this second world war, compared with 1914-18, even allowing for civilian casualties. It was a wise decision by our leaders. If the point is now taken that in a future world organisation a small nation

of advanced scientific powers can offset numerical weakness by its superior intelligence, holding larger nations in check, then we must face not only a biological but an economic problem. Such a small but exceptionally endowed intelligent nation can by threat hold a larger nation in check, while the scientific Power retains its intellectual and other advantages. But the economic and biological factors are supreme in peace-time and must never be overlooked. If the scientifically powerful few are controlling resources of livelihood without which the numerically larger group cannot live, then one of two things must happen. The few must contribute some of those resources to the needy many, or they must consent to numbers of the less-favoured groups declining or dying from want. That is the simple alternative, even in a scientific age. But don't let us be shocked or surprised if, facing such desperation, some of the "have nots" organise themselves for an aggressive attempt, even on the scientifically powerful "haves." After all, an unemployed or hungry man has little enough to lose, apart from his bleak and difficult sheer physical existence.

The biological aspect of this contrast between nations of tough mental fibre and those of mere animal robustness is very important. The natural power of human fertility is not likely to cease operating because America has atomic power and Asia has not got it—yet. So America cannot look at the swarming East with any reassurance that atomic power in peace-time, or any other instrument of science, will solve the problem of food and shelter for those masses unless she contributes a clear and purposeful intention that a solution shall be found, no matter what present human interests stand in the way. A statesman actuated by a scientific outlook would accept that proposition as a basis of policy. Let us take an example in Europe. The same intelligent outlook unhesitatingly condemns as sheer folly, certain to lead to ultimate conflict, the actions of Poland and Czechoslovakia, following the Potsdam Conference, of forcibly expelling to the West millions of Germans who have lived, sometimes for generations, on land now to be

included in the redrawn Western frontiers of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Such an action is the reverse of scientific. To divorce millions of human beings from the land that supported them, to more densely populate Western Germany already crowded to suffocation, to leave millions of acres of the provinces east of the Oder-Neisse line very sparsely inhabited by the numerically fewer Poles, is just to create another storm-cloud over Europe which is bound to burst some day. The German problem is not solved by leaving or thrusting millions of them into a de-industrialised, stripped and dismembered country, with no outlet or overseas resources. Is emigration to follow? Is any land ready to receive ten or twenty million Germans? The solution by Germany to the same problem during the war was Oswiecim, which was a complete biological answer to excess numbers—but will it appeal to Western Powers? If Poland's reply to this criticism of her demographic settlement with Germany is that she in her turn is being pushed West by Russia seizing her Eastern Provinces and steadily forcing numbers of Poles to the West, then the scientific outlook calls for the recognition of the essential oneness of this planet; it urges the common man to exercise his democratic right to call on his statesmen for wiser leadership; it demands that the world be clearly and intelligently informed of these issues. The scientist knows that the general intelligence and standard of the mass may be ahead of what it is presumed to be by so-called leaders. The East and the West must come to terms before there can be peace on this earth, and human intelligence asks that it be realised sooner rather than later. In asking this, science once again stresses its fundamental duty of seeking to add to human life, rather than detract from it. Science prefers to create, not to destroy. It points to the overwhelming fact that a very few years of peaceful application of penicillin, D.D.T., and other discoveries will save an amount of human life far exceeding all war losses. And science is quite prepared to solve any resulting problems from that increase in numbers.

This brief chapter on science and its relation to aggression

may be closed with a short appeal to man's reason. Human populations should not "just grow." Blind growth, already condemned with plant life in the field and animal life in the stock-yard, should submit to the control of human judgment in the highest reproduction of all. Historically, it is well known that fluctuating numbers of people, especially excess births following upon periods or circumstances of bountiful means of livelihood, have led to attacks by one group or nation upon a neighbour. Now, in a world well known for its dimensions and resources, is it not time that equitable adjustment governed such matters? We live in an age when man can release atomic energy and fly; he can speak to his friends across the oceans; he can isolate and control the germs of deadly diseases; he can prolong the average length of human life; he can travel under-sea or hold mighty rivers in check; he can transmute metals and preserve his food; he can clothe himself from waste products. All this and much more, tribute to man's intelligence. Is it asking very much more that he should control and adjust his own numbers in relation to their subsistence and enjoyment of life? It is a matter for all nations, not for one or two acting in isolation. We have ventured with a League of Nations, an International Labour Office, a Hague Convention, and other arrangements for co-operation between nations. Now the time is at hand for us to venture with a scientific institution for the better understanding and adjustment of those masses of humanity known and inexpertly handled to-day as national populations. Is not this a suitable and primary interest for our new United Nations' Organisation?

We can take encouragement from some recent words of Sir Lawrence Bragg, that our world to-day stands at the threshold of a new epoch, the age of science, as profound in its implication as the period when man became cultivator and not hunter. Facing such a dawn, let us hope and determine that human life itself shall lead the ascent.

Abjuring Aggression

SPEAKING in the war-scarred Guildhall of the City of London in October, 1943, General Smuts, Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, had this to say:

“But more difficult problems lie ahead in connection with the peace—above all the problem of aggression, the basic problem before our race and the future of our civilised society. It is the last obstacle to be overcome in our long upward climb from our primeval savagery. Here we come up at last against the toughest and, let me add, one of the most heroic instincts of the race—the instinct of the animal in us, of the beast, but of the king of beasts, the lion and the tiger. The Christian Gospel still fights in vain against this earlier, more deeply founded gospel of our race, which is still upheld in some countries and circles as the code of honour and virtue for our society. The blond beast, the Superman of Nietzsche, still hurls defiance at the Christian code with its gentle virtues. That last battle in the West, in our Western civilisation, our race must win or die. We have reached that stage when the issue has to be squarely joined with the earlier, darker rule of force, and aggression—war as an instrument of national policy—has to be finally abjured. Its roots go deep into the past, and even into the structure of our modern society, composed as it is of national sovereign States. But, even so, the time has come for it to go. Let us make up our minds that it shall go, that no false pride of independent nationhood, of isolated sovereignties, shall defeat the great

hope and vision of a peaceful, ordered human society, steadily moving forward to the attainment of the high social and spiritual ideals which have been the inspiration of the greatest spirits of our race."

Notice some points from this moving statement. Aggression is defined as "war as an instrument of national policy." It is "the basic problem before our race." "Its roots go deep into the structure of our modern society of national sovereign States." And note the "vision of a peaceful ordered human society." The pregnant word here is "ordered," which also means planned and controlled. If the vision is accepted and to be achieved, can human populations, most vital of all forces, avoid ordering and planning?

Such a question implies that what has been postulated in this little volume as underlying modern aggression, the pressure of large populations suffering from unemployment, hunger and want through insufficient living-space or faulty economic systems, does in fact so operate in our world to-day. If it does, is it surprising that bewildered statesmen, faced with masses of citizens crying for work, food and shelter on the one hand, and with a rigid, unyielding, nationalistic and uneven system of sharing the world's resources on the other hand, turn to "war as an instrument of national policy"? It is the easiest way out, a temporary side-step, especially in a world of machine capitalism. Machines can work at full pressure for war's emergency; they falter and stop in peace, because there are loose cogs somewhere in the economic machinery.

Let us honour General Smuts for his reminder that the Christian Gospel has its quarrel with human aggression. No more grievous blow to the Christian ethic has been given than by the sanitary incinerator following in the wake of modern armies, or in attendance in towns after air raids, to dispose of human bodies. Or by bulldozers employed to dig and cover mass graves for soldiers fallen in fruitless attack and counter-attack. Millions of human beings, men, women and children, born to the dignity of a likeness to God and dying prematurely

in the horror of human strife that does not solve even its own basic problem.

The reader may ask: Can national populations be controlled on an international level? Why not? If science can step in to advance the biological standards of plant and animal life, why should it stop short of human advancement? If the alternative to a sane and calculated adjustment of people to means of livelihood is a recurring series of world wars, humanity will find such conflict ends in death. Admittedly it calls for a vision and discipline that may range from political statesmanship to the individual marriage-bed, with the relinquishing of a number of long-cherished ideas. Matching the "false pride of independent nationhood" may be another dumb pride in excessive fertility. Global conflicts to reach a solution of humanity's population fluxes are the distinguishing features of this century. Unless the twenty-first century governs its human ebb and flow with a more scientific control and adjustment, within the framework of a world plan, it will certainly fail to enjoy peace.

Whether human populations can be subject to international control may be illustrated in the compact case of the Japanese at Hawaii. The position here, in its simplest terms, is that if no control is exercised on their procreation, in a very short time they will overrun the whole islands. Will the fact of similar citizenship reconcile the Americans to that position? To avoid it, definite practical steps must be taken. So what is to prevent the American Government fixing a maximum number to the Japanese who will be permitted to live in the islands, and clearly warning them that any surplus will be transported elsewhere? Elsewhere, on President Roosevelt's "pushing back" policy, could be only Japan itself. What does stand in the way is just this—the American pride in equal citizenship to those born within its borders; the conventional and legislative reluctance to impose birth control; these and similar factors rule at the moment. They must be reconsidered or the alternative will be racial strife when the white

Americans realise too late that any Hawaiian birthright they possessed has passed into yellow hands. And there are many other Hawaiis.

How many Americans, listening to the fireside talk of their President at Christmas, 1943, recognised in such passages as the following, anything more than generalities making no attempt whatever to deal with basic causes of aggression?

"Essential to all peace and security in the Pacific and in the rest of the world is the permanent elimination of the Empire of Japan as a potential force of aggression."

And:

"If the people of Germany and Japan are made to realise thoroughly that the world is not going to let them break out again, it is possible, and I hope probable, that they will abandon the philosophy of aggression."

To speak of the United Nations "forming a band of steel which is closing in on Japan," and declare they "have no intention to enslave the German people. We wish them to have a normal chance to develop, in peace, as useful and respectable members of the European family," is to state a meaningless illogicality unless full account is taken of the expanding populations of those two countries. Or is the world going to so control those populations that they will not need to "break out again"? Failing that, President Roosevelt himself was indulging in the sort of pious hope he condemned in others, in the same speech.

The common man, not his rulers, pays the major price of wars, as all history shows. It has fallen to the twentieth century to prove how utterly debased can be the value of that common man's life. It is quite time he revalued himself. It is full time for the many to triumph over the few, but here is the dilemma of all large communities. When nations grow to aggregations of millions of human beings, living together in a common land with one language, one currency, one central government, certain supreme values vanish. The individual feels himself utterly lost, as only one of so many. Regimenta-

tion, whether by democracy or totalitarianism, appears to be necessary and then natural. Most deadly of all, a feeling of spiritual paralysis saps his response to the implications of wars and other human disasters, checks to the progress of man. Ten thousand people can be killed in an air raid overnight, and it leaves the mass man unmoved. Unless and until the common man can recover his real sense of community, his genuine concern for his neighbour, he will remain a dumb cause and victim of his rulers' policies of aggression. He has his own responsibility in the matter, but it is small compared with that of his leaders, who have the power to-day to lead him to wiser ends.

How to abjure aggression? Ultimately, it is the conflict between the primordial animal in man and his higher nature, which means his response to uplifting influences, principal of which for the average man is his religion. Although that is the ultimate issue, as a conflict it is made increasingly severe and complex in our world to-day by failure to recognise the important part played in our economic life by the machine, and sheer masses of people. As the machine, and with it the impetus to great increases in man's numbers, sprang from the human mind, it is to that direction we should look for the control of all its effects. Science will have much to say during the next fifty years on the adjustment of human populations. If that message can be received and applied with a spirit not less in moral value than the Christian ethic, there is hope for us.

In the prefatory note to this book there is a reference to the silence of statesmen on modern population problems. It is not a complete silence, for occasionally a voice is heard. But there is no sustained warning, no direct guidance to the masses from their rulers. Look at the human wreckage in Italy, following the ousting of Mussolini. After some years of fervid encouragement to indiscriminate breeding in an already overpopulated country, the regime of "eight million bayonets" collapses ignobly and leaves mass starvation and disease in its train. That is an example of wilful misguidance by rulers in

the handling of a country's population. It can be matched elsewhere.

Honest and complete frankness is necessary if our little world is to hold in peace those extra thousands of millions due to arrive in it in the next century. In this matter we must learn, and that quickly, to look at the world as a whole, not in sectional nations. In the global sense it matters something, but far from everything, that a particular country, be it France, Sweden, Britain or any other, has, or will have shortly a declining population. It is the broad mass of increasing humanity, whatever its present colour or geographical position, that must hold our attention. There must be peaceful adjustment and control to remove want, or violent aggression.

Humanity's very long-term destiny in this small world is fusion, which involves intermarriage, between all races. We need not concern ourselves with a development of the year, say, 4000, but we must have in mind that overwhelming population figure of the year 2100. It is approaching rapidly, and the throes of its approach can be seen and suffered in world wars to-day.

ADDENDUM

WILL the common man of all lands accept that it is largely the numerical but unequal pressure of his own species, often in want, which underlies much of twentieth century aggression? If so, he is very likely to retort in his own language—what is to be done about it?

Is he to continue reproducing his species at an increasing rate throughout the world, leaving it to global conflicts, spasmodic emigration, and other ineffectual means to achieve partial solutions? In other words, buying with his own blood short periods of time in which to enjoy a false, ephemeral sense of peace and security, before the next eruption?

The answer is with the common man's rulers, on whom lies a heavy responsibility during the next hundred years. It will be the highest task of statesmanship to guide the human races towards a solution of their biological crisis while this planet is receiving its maximum numbers of human beings. Here are ten points which it is suggested will repay the consideration of statesmen when reflecting on their basic obligation to the common man, to guide him to a fair life on earth not by war-like aggression, but by human wisdom, judgment and control.

- (1) There must be a frank and wide recognition that the problem does exist and is of the nature stated.
- (2) Next, is it to be faced and solved by the will of man, or are hands to be thrown up in despair? The first alternative may, and probably will, lead to an acceptable solution; the second will lead to a chaos of human conflict and death.
- (3) If man chooses the way of control, a first and constant

need is to restore some sanctity to human life. Individual lives must recover their value, and man must develop his sense of community and neighbourliness. One among a maximum of six thousand millions sounds remotely small and unimportant, but unless the mass can hold its particles, disintegration is inevitable. The human mass must discover its supreme moral cohesive; its nature will not be unlike Christ's message.

- (4) Mass warfare, if continued in future years with all the power of science and soulless propaganda on the mind of the common man, will result in the extermination of the inhabitants of entire countries. Banish mass warfare, therefore, by postulating and achieving a condition in all countries where the mass of humanity experiences more of satisfaction than dissatisfaction.
- (5) Recognising that in human nature there is a striving of the will to power, let the common man keep unceasing watch on his rulers. Apply a penalty, swift and remorseless, to that personal ambition or ego which misuses the lives of men in human carnage.
- (6) A fundamental characteristic is fluidity — human populations grow and decline, quickly or slowly. Change being the essence of the problem, there must be a similar willingness to recognise that the earth's resources in food, shelter and clothing need continual reallocation on a world plan in proportion to numbers.
- (7) Any economic system which by its rigidity or vested human interest fails to allow for the factors in point 6 must be changed. Failure or unwillingness to make such change will result in human conflict.
- (8) Viewing the world as a whole, rigid national boundaries act as temporary confining checks, but eventually any swelling mass of people, known generally as a national population, is bound to burst its banks when numbers exceed resources. It follows that peaceful adjustment demands emigration, or reallocation of land to people.

Refusal to permit such access to resources is equivalent to ultimate invasion by stealth or force. Small overcrowded countries, however, like Britain, Belgium, Holland, Japan, may continue under that pressure provided their populations have access to the resources of other lands with unimpeded communications.

- (9) That point in the Atlantic Charter, freedom from want, if stated and applied to all nations with sincerity, implies acceptance of fluctuating fertilities, with no colour bar anywhere in a small, closely knit world. Sufficient food, clothing and shelter for all will in itself tend to increase births and prolong life. Obviously, a balance is demanded, and at some point or stage control on the national and international level must be forthcoming.
- (10) Man being animal as well as human, education contends with the primeval to ensure the triumph of quality over quantity. Here is the statesman's call to the common man to help himself.

Accepting that the first part of point 2 will apply, that the mind and will of man will endeavour to solve this basic problem, can we not look ahead a little and see a solution emerging somewhat on these lines? Chapter six closed with a plea for a scientific institution to investigate and guide the world on its human inhabitants. Let us credit this body with some such title as the International Population Commission. It would be composed of delegates from constituent national bodies, for quite obviously the problem has its national and international scope. What would be the nature of the Commission's work? Here is a general outline, stating it first on the international level, and passing through the national phase to the individual, unit of population and star in the drama of life.

Implement the political consent and machinery necessary to handle a world problem on a world basis.

Examine and constantly review the dimensions and resources

of all countries. Life-supporting potential would be the approach, both as to maximum numbers that can be maintained, and minimum numbers to ensure no waste of living possibilities.

Adequate scientific examination of all phases of human fertility and sterility, providing the physiological knowledge on which to base a controlled stability of numbers.

Equal knowledge and understanding of the economic machinery of the world, by which humanity may support itself by production and interchange of food and goods.

Constant watch on the flux and flow of humanity, so that national populations maintain harmony with existing resources.

Recommend periodically such adjustment of numbers to individual nations as will maintain that harmony between life and resources.

Supervise international emigration or other mass movement of peoples.

Prepare and disseminate amongst delegate nations information on population problems.

Nations, basing their population policies on a world-wide agreement, to undertake education on the subject among their citizens.

National governments, placing their population policies above party or sectarian interests, to establish permanent machinery for control and guidance.

Marriages between potential parents to be preceded by medical examination and subsequent grading for children.

Maximum numbers for a nation being known and agreed, replacement of life to this total to be allocated on the basis of medical grade.

A system of family allowances or equivalent financial reliefs to be operative, in harmony with the population policy.

Civilised marriage to be lifted above sectarian prejudice, with man and woman recognising communal obligations as well as insisting on individual rights.

AGGRESSION AND POPULATION

Parents encouraged to aim at selective quality in children in place of indiscriminate breeding.

Parents to recognise the State's right to a voice in family totals and qualities, in return for the individual family having the benefits and protection of the aggregate of families in the nation.

*

*

If the common man should hear cries of fantastic, futile, irreligious, impossible, visionary and similar epithets greet these suggestions, let him reflect upon this. This twentieth century has fully confirmed that on present methods, the price of huge masses of humanity seeking to live together in uncontrolled concentrations within inadequate national boundaries is large-scale unemployment and want, leading to mass death for millions in famine, disease, and especially in wars of aggression. Even so, our numbers to-day continue to increase blindly, unevenly and swiftly; human beings are being produced at a rate far exceeding many countries' capacity to support them. Citizenship of the world, especially of rival Great Powers, on those terms is a hazardous outlook for millions of the young and unborn generations. Is such blind growth and premature death to prevail; or is man to undertake full control of his individual and collective life? The issue is quite clear cut.

